

<b>DISPATCH</b>		CLASSIFICATION	PROCESSING ACTION
		SECRET	MARKED FOR INDEXING
			XX
INFO. Chief, EUR;			NO INDEXING REQUIRED
FROM			ONLY QUALIFIED DESK CAN JUDGE INDEXING
SUBJECT CAGER CATRIBE			MICROFILM
Meeting with @PRANNER in Berlin			
ACTION REQUIRED - REFERENCES			

REFERENCE: EGBA-91124

1. Prior to the receipt of referenced dispatch, the subject of @PRANNER's role in Berlin was raised by CATRIBE's Chief of Operations, @ACKERMANN, during a routine liaison session on 1 September 1971. Attached is a copy of the contact report covering the meeting with @ACKERMANN. FYI, [ ] read the contact report during a recent visit to [ ] and suggested it be forwarded for [ ] information.

2. Currently we do not plan to respond further to @ACKERMANN but anticipate that upcoming discussions on CAMOTET with CATRIBE at a level above @ACKERMANN's will touch on the Berlin situation and the extent of future "cooperation" with @PRANNER.

ATTACHMENT: Herewith

Contact Report

DISTRIBUTION:

2 [ ] w/att  
2 [ ] w/att  
4 - Chief/EUR w/att

DECLASSIFIED AND RELEASED BY  
CENTRAL INTELLIGENCE AGENCY  
SOURCE METHOD EXEMPTION 3B2B  
NAZI WAR CRIMES DISCLOSURE ACT  
DATE 2008

@ACKERMANN

CROSS REFERENCE TO	DISPATCH SYMBOL AND NUMBER	DATE
	EGMA-75501	27 SEP 1971
	CLASSIFICATION	HQS FILE NUMBER
	SECRET	22 September 71
		32W-5-25/1

S E C R E T

ATTACHMENT TO EGMA-75501, 22 September 71

CONTACT REPORT - 1 September 1971

☐ ☐ with @ACKERMANN

OCT 7 1971

1. @ACKERMANN had responded to our request for a meeting by stating he had a matter pertaining to Berlin that he wished to table. After we had concluded several items of outstanding business, @ACKERMANN took the floor. He led in by recalling the birth of CASKEG and the arrival of ☐ ☐. He articulated regrets that the effort had not reached fruition. From the discussion in and around CASKEG, said @ACKERMANN, CATRIBE had been influenced to get a real operator of the younger generation placed in Berlin. Heretofore, only old chaps who did nothing but liaise with Berlin authorities had been positioned there. Now they had @PRANNER there and he is somewhat chagrined and disappointed. On 23 August ☐ ☐ met for the first time with @PRANNER although a meeting in early June had been anticipated. ☐ ☐ had apologized for the delay. Although ☐ ☐ had been very courteous and very hospitable, he did state in a round-about way (liess durchblicken) that ☐ ☐ experience going back even before the Wall shows that joint operations have led to nothing--each service must do its own thing. Now, said @ACKERMANN, CATRIBE is confused about JKLANCE policy. @PRANNER was specifically selected and sent to Berlin to cooperate with JKLANCE rather than fall back into the comfortable but unproductive liaison racket. @PRANNER is too valuable to be wasted on liaison in Berlin.

2. We listened until he had completed his bleat. We did not argue with him about the incongruity of his reference to CASKEG, in which it was agreed by implication there would be no joint operations. We did suggest that, perhaps, we should understand each others language. It was our impression that so-called joint operations had proven to be impracticable and that JKLANCE did not engage in joint operations with any service, not even the British. Aha, but had not the Penkovskiy case been a joint British-American operation, asked @ACKERMANN. Sense of our response was that the Brits started the operation, ran out of steam and offered it to the Americans. When JKLANCE accepted, it was

S E C R E T

h/w att. 1 to EGMA-75501

CS COPY

32W-5-25/1

S E C R E T

2

carried on unilaterally. We stated that, leaving the concept of joint operations aside, there was room for cooperation. One side could give an ops lead to the other when it felt the other side could exploit the lead better. @ACKERMANN chimed in with CALLIKAK support that JKLANCE could render CATRIBE in Berlin. There were probably other areas where cooperation could be instituted. @ACKERMANN repeated the "What is JKLANCE policy; can't waste @PRANNER"- line. We said we would apprise [ ] and [ ] @ACKERMANN said we'd keep this one oral, he wouldn't write a memo on it. We said we'd have cause for clarifying discussions at a later date and a request for definition of JKLANCE policy did not need to be perpetuated in a memo.

S E C R E T

32W-5-25/1